

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/799,703	03/15/2004	Jozef Babiarz	57983.000158	8971	
	7590 05/05/200 VILLIAMS LLP	EXAM	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200			JAIN,	JAIN, RAJ K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006-1109	2616	2616		
			MAIL DATE	DET HERMALONE	
			05/05/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/799,703	BABIARZ, JOZEF	
Examiner	Art Unit	
RAJ K. JAIN	2616	

	10 10 10 07 1114	2010					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 31 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
 X he reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance, (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07().						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be	filed within two months	of the date of				
Filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	appeal. Since a				
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor 			cause				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		i E below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co.	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324)				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmen	nt canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).	onable ii dabiiiiida iii a deparate;	annony mod amondmon	it carrosing the				
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the pr		I be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
	/Raj K Jain/						
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2616					

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner has fully addressed all limitations in the Final Office Action submitted 1/24/08.

Applicant contends Hadi Salim fails to disclose a "flow rate associated with a plurality of packets entering or exiting a network". Examiner respectfully disagrees, see col 2 lines 57-63, col 3 lines 33-37 flow rate is determined by means of a packet flow control parameter to control the flow of packets from a source to destiantion. Node congestion and ultimate determination to see how many packets may be accepted or transferred is also a form of "flow rate" which either increases or decreases based on specific node thresholds.

Further applicant contends "marking at least one predetermined bit in at least one of the plurality of packets if the flow rate is greater than a predetermined rate,". Examiner disagreesses see Fig. 3, cold line 55, oc 16 line 15, a CE bit is marked as a placetermined bit based on congestion status, further "flags" or predetermined bits that are marked are measured to see if the flow of packets exceeds a threshold and rate is addusted accordingly. oct 1 lines 44-65.

Applicant further contends "that nowhere does Hadi Salim disclose, or even suggest, allocating a share of the capacity is a disclosure of "a predetermined rate,". This contention is moot as it is not in the claims of question.

Examiner once again asserts that all limitations are taught within the cited references and therefore the rejection to claims 1-11 and 14-19 is sustained